Serial No.: 09/787,594

REMARKS

Claims 38-84 are now pending in the application. Claims 51-59, 61, 63, 64, 66, 68, 70, 72, 78, 81 and 82 are presently under consideration. Claims 51, 61, 63, 66, 68, 70, 72, 74, 76, 78 and 80-82 have been amended herein. Claims 83 and 84 have been newly added. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. ELECTIONS/RESTRICTIONS

The Examiner identifies claims 38-50, 60, 62, 65, 67, 69, 71, 77, 79 and 80 as having been withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention.

Regarding claims 74, 76 and 80, the Examiner indicates that the claim language does not read upon the elected species despite applicants' assertions. The Examiner indicates that the two front/rear retarders recited in the claims are not shown in Fig. 12.

In order to clarify better the relationship between the claimed "front/rear quarter wave plate", the "two front/rear retarders" and the "combination retarder", claims 74 and 76 have been amended to recite that the front quarter wave plate forms part of an achromatic combination retarder, and the achromatic combination retarder is modified to compensate for ~~the~~ residual retardation of the LC at finite voltages. For example, in Fig. 12 the half wave plates 44 and 62 and the quarter wave plates 108 and 112 are illustrated. See, e.g., Spec., p. 15, lines 4-7.

As for claim 80, this claim has been amended to depend from claim 64 which is under consideration.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 74, 76 and 80, as amended, read upon the elected species of Fig. 12. Consideration of these claims together with the remaining elected claims is respectfully requested.

II. OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 66, 68, 70 AND 72

Claims 66, 68, 70 and 72 stand objected to. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Serial No.: 09/787,594

Regarding claims 66 and 68, applicants have adopted the Examiner's suggestion and amended the claims to depend from claim 59 rather than claim 51.

Regarding claims 70 and 72, applicants have amended the claims to provide proper antecedent basis for the retarders.

Also regarding claim 68, the Examiner suggests changing "front and rear polarisers are crossed polarisers" to "front and rear polarisers are crossed polarisation axes". Applicants have amended claim 68 to recite the "front and rear polarisers have crossed polarisation axes", which applicants believe to be similar to but a bit more clear than the Examiner's proposal.

III. ADDITIONAL CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claim 51 has been amended to provide additional clarity in the claim language. In addition, minor amendments have been made to claims 40, 41, 61, 63, 78, 81 and 82 to correct typographical errors and clarify antecedent basis. Additionally, claims 83 and 84 have been added to emphasize further features of the invention. Support for such claims is found, for example, in the present application at page 14, lines 12-17 and 4-8, respectively.

IV. REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 51-54, 56-58, 61 and 63 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on Kubo et al. in view of Ge et al. Claim 55 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on Kubo et al. in view of Ge et al., and further in view of Jacobsen et al. Claims 59, 66, 68, 78 and 81 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on Kubo et al. in view of Ge et al., and further in view of Kishimoto. Claims 64 and 82 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on Kubo et al. in view of Ge et al., and further in view of Kishimoto and Handschy et al. Claims 70 and 72 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on Kubo et al. in view of Ge et al., and further in view of Kishimoto and Sharp et al. Withdrawal of each of these rejections is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

The Examine relies on Kubo et al. as teaching each of the features recited in claim 51 with the exception of a backlight comprising a plurality of sequentially flashing light sources. However, the Examiner contends that Ge et al. teaches a plurality of sequentially flashing light sources with different colors for improving brightness and efficiency (citing column 7, lines 12-13). The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the transflective display described in Kubo et al. based on the teachings of Ge et al. in order to improve brightness and efficiency.

i. Claim 51

Applicants note that claim 51 recites each pixel being provided with a light filter in addition to the backlight comprising a plurality of sequentially flashing light sources. The Examiner contends that Kubo et al. includes such light filters, and that it would have bene obvious to modify Kubo et al. to include sequentially flashing light sources with different color in order to improve brightness and efficiency. However, Ge et al. makes clear in column 7, lines 7-14 that an advantage of such sequentially flashing light sources is that color filters are *not* needed. The resulting LCD therefore possesses a high level of brightness and efficiency. In other words, Ge et al. teaches that in order to obtain a high level of brightness and efficiency, one would *not* include the color filters. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that it is incorrect to argue that the motivation for combining the teachings is to provide for a high level of brightness and efficiency.

In other words, the Examiner's motivation to combine the teachings of Kubo et al. and Ge et al. is flawed since Ge et al. teaches that the use of light filters is undesirable. The teachings of the references must be considered as a whole. One skilled in the art would not be lead to combine the teachings of Kubo et al. and Ge et al. as Ge et al. clearly teaches away from the proposed combination.[1]

---

[1]See, e.g., Col. 1, lns. 22-44 of Ge et al., which recites "...demonstrates certain drawbacks such as low brightness and low efficiency due to the low transmittance of colour filter, smaller aperture, and polarizers", and "possesses a series of attractive features... demonstrates a high level of efficiency as it uses larger apertures without the

Accordingly, the references teach away from the combination proposed by the Examiner. The proposed combination would not have been obvious, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 51 is respectfully requested.

ii. Claims 56

Claim 56 recites "wherein each colour filter provides a varying level of absorption across its area". The Examiner contends that such feature is taught by Kubo et al. in Col. 28, lines 46-47 and Figs. 30-31.

However, there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited portions of Kubo et al. to motivate one skilled in the art to use colour filters with varying levels of absorption across their area. Figs. 30 and 31 show unshaded areas and shaded areas (elements 207 and 208). These correspond to transmissive and reflective regions of the cell (Col. 29, lines 3-10) and are totally different from filters having varying levels of absorption across their area. In fact, none of the elements in the figures indicated by the Examiner even corresponds to a light filter, and as such the sections of Kubo et al. referred to by the Examiner do not teach or suggest the claimed feature of the color filters providing a varying level of absorption.

Such deficiency in the teachings of Kubo et al. is not made up by the remaining portions thereof, which are directed to a display having a partially transmissive and partially reflective *electrode*. Moreover, none of the secondary and tertiary references teach or suggest such feature.

iii. Claim 57

Claim 57 recites that "each colour filter has a transparent region". This feature is not taught or suggested by Kubo et al. The transmissive and reflective regions shown in Figs. 30 and 31 of Kubo et al. do not correspond to filters, and are entirely different from the claimed invention.

---

need of colour filter arrays and polarizers".

Serial No.: 09/787,594

iv. Claim 58

Regarding claim 58, the claim recites "each transmissive area is optically aligned with a transparent region of one of said colour filters". There is no teaching or suggestion in any of the references of using a colour filter having transparent regions. As such, the further limitation of aligning these with transmissive regions of the electrodes cannot be taught or suggested by any of the references.

In other words, none of the cited references taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest any type of arrangement where each color filter has a transparent region and each of the partially reflective electrodes have a light transmissive area which is optically aligned with a transparent region of one of the color filters.

The remaining rejected claims depend directly or indirectly from one of the above-discussed claims, and can be distinguished for at least the same reasons stated above.

V. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Serial No.: 09/787,594

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

Mark D. Saralino
Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: September 5, 2003

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113
C:\GEN\YAMA\yamap757.amd.wpd